

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, which place the application into a condition for allowance.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 are rejected and claim 4 is objected to in the Office Action mailed June 20, 2007. By this amendment, independent claim 1 is amended as outlined above and claims 3 and 4 have been canceled without prejudice to their subsequent prosecution in any continuing application or disclaimer of the proprietary rights set forth therein. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the Specification, for example, see paragraphs [0012] and [0013] of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0099895 (“the instant application”). It is believed that no new subject matter is added as a result of the amendments to the claims.

Initially, the Examiner is thanked for indicating that claim 4 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, as indicated above and discussed below, the claims have been amended to include the limitations of claim 4, and intervening claim 3, into claim 1.

**II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by European Patent Application Publication 0 582 484 to Lloyd *et al.*

(“Lloyd”). In addition, claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by European Patent Application Publication 0 462 955 to Waldenstrom *et al.* (“Waldenstrom”). The rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

By this amendment, independent claim 1 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 4 that was determined to be allowable, as well as the subject matter of intervening claim 3. Specifically, claim 1 is amended to recite that the substrate of the tool insert is a tungsten carbide substrate. Further, claim 1, as amended, recites that the protective layer is formed from a tungsten carbide material different from that of the substrate, or from a tool steel, or from another suitable material.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of Lloyd and Waldenstrom and is therefore allowable. Further, claims 2, 5 and 6 that depend from claim 1, are allowable therewith.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicant's undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and an early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

  
Ronald R. Santucci  
Reg. No. 28,988

(212) 588-0800 (Phone)  
(212) 588-0500 (Fax)